COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CIVIL ACTION NO.:

ADAM HELFAND, CARON HELFAND, AND MITCHELL HELFAND, Plaintiffs	04 11800 DPW
v. THE JOHN DEWEY ACADEMY, INC., THOMAS BRATTER, KEN STEINER, AND GWENDOLYN HAMPTON, Defendants	RECEIPT # AMOUNT \$ 60 SUMMONS ISSUED 65 LOCAL RULE 4.1 WAIVER FORM MCF ISSUED BY DPTY, CLK

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

INTRODUCTION

1. This action arises out of an inappropriate relationship between an employee of The John Dewey Academy, Inc. ("JDA") and a former student. The Plaintiffs allege that JDA and its top staff negligently hired the employee and negligently supervised the employee and the student. JDA also breached its contract with the plaintiffs and engaged in unfair and deceptive business practices in violation of the Massachusetts Consumer Protection Act, G.L. c. 93A. The employee committed counseling malpractice and negligently inflicted emotional distress on the student. As a result of the acts and omissions of the Defendants, the Plaintiffs suffered great emotional and financial harm.

<u>JURISDICTION</u>

 This court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332, as there is diversity of citizenship among the parties and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.

PARTIES

- The Plaintiff, Adam Helfand, is an individual with a permanent residence address of 2544 Buckland Lane, Northbrook, Illinois.
- 4. The Plaintiffs, Mitchell and Caron Helfand, are individuals with a permanent residence address of 2544 Buckland Lane, Northbrook, Illinois.
 They are the parents of Adam Helfand.
- 5. The Defendant, The John Dewey Academy, Inc., is a Massachusetts corporation with a principal place of business at 389 Main Street, Great Barrington, Massachusetts. JDA is an alternative coeducational college preparatory boarding school for students with behavioral and substance abuse problems.
- 6. The Defendant, Thomas Bratter, is an individual whose residence address is unknown. He is the founder and director of JDA.
- 7. The Defendant, Ken Steiner, is an individual whose residence address is unknown. He is the Dean of JDA.
- 8. The Defendant, Gwendolyn Hampton, is an individual whose residence address, on information and belief, is 68-69 Monument Valley Road, Great Barrington, Massachusetts. She was a teacher and clinician at JDA during all relevant times.

FACTS

9. JDA is a small residential school with a varying student population of between fifteen and thirty students. Each student attends classes, meets individually with a mental health counselor, and participates in group therapy. Many students also have work assignments at the school. Upon enrollment, each student is assigned a "primary clinician." The primary

Filed 08/(7)/2004

- 10. Adam Helfand enrolled as a student at JDA in the summer of 1999 when he was seventeen (17) years old. When Adam arrived at JDA, he was an oppositional young man whose drug and alcohol use had caused him to be expelled from high school in his home town in Illinois. For each year he attended JDA, Adam Helfand's parents, Mitchell and Caron Helfand, entered into a contract with the Defendant, JDA, by which they would pay JDA substantial sums of money in return for which JDA would educate their child in a safe and closely supervised therapeutic environment, free from sexual molestation, drugs, and alcohol. Cumulatively, these contracts spanned the period from June 10, 1999 to August 31, 2001. Adam Helfand was the intended third party beneficiary of the contract.
- 11. On information and belief, JDA hired Defendant Hampton in the early 1990's. At all times relevant to the complaint, Defendant Hampton was a Spanish teacher and "clinician" at JDA. She also supervised the school kitchen, which prepared meals for staff and students. For some of the periods relevant to the complaint, Defendant Hampton lived at JDA as a houseparent. At the time of her hiring and at all times relevant to the complaint, Defendant Hampton was not qualified to provide mental health counseling services.
- 12. In November 1999, JDA assigned Defendant Hampton to be Adam Helfand's "primary clinician." As such, Defendant Hampton acted as his

Filed 08/17/2004

- 13. In the spring of 2000, Defendant Hampton began a sexual relationship with Adam Helfand. The relationship lasted throughout the remainder of Adam's time at JDA, and continued through his freshman year of college. The relationship resulted in the birth of a child on June 15, 2002. This child was ultimately placed for adoption. Hampton's sexual encounters with Adam generally occurred after regular school hours, in the school car, or at Defendant Hampton's private residence. During much of the time relevant to the complaint, no adults were present at JDA at night to supervise the students. The school car was readily accessible to students at night, enabling Adam to leave campus to be with Defendant Hampton.
- 14. Students and staff remarked on the inappropriate nature of Defendant

 Hampton's relationship with Adam, but JDA, Defendant Bratter and

 Defendant Steiner failed to thoroughly investigate the relationship, failed to

 discipline Defendant Hampton, failed to properly supervise her work with

Adam Helfand, and failed to implement policies and procedures to prevent the ongoing inappropriate conduct.

Filed 08/17/2004

- 15. In addition to engaging in an inappropriate sexual relationship with Adam while purporting to counsel him, to help him to overcome substance and alcohol abuse, and to teach him to make responsible, constructive decisions, Defendant Hampton regularly provided Adam with alcohol, which she consumed with him, and she encouraged his use of illegal drugs. She used her influence in all JDA decisions regarding him to ensure his loyalty to her. The secrecy necessary to maintain the relationship isolated Adam from his parents and peers.
- 16. The acts and omissions of the Defendants caused the Plaintiffs great emotional and financial harm, and amounted to a breach of contract involving unfair and deceptive business practices.

COUNT I (vs. JDA -- Negligent Hiring)

- 17. The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the complaints as set forth in paragraphs 1 through 16 above.
- 18. Defendant JDA negligently hired Defendant Hampton to act as primary clinician for its students. On information and belief, Defendant Hampton lacked the academic and practical credentials to provide mental health counseling. Defendants knew or reasonably should have known Defendant Hampton was unqualified to provide mental health counseling.
- 19. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence of the Defendant JDA in hiring Defendant Hampton, the Plaintiffs suffered severe and permanent mental distress and emotional harm as well as other consequential damages.

COUNT II

(vs. JDA, Thomas Bratter, Kenneth Steiner -- Negligent Supervision of Defendant Hampton)

- 20. The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the complaints as set forth in paragraphs 1 through 19 above.
- 21. At all relevant times, Defendants JDA, Thomas Bratter and Kenneth Steiner failed to properly supervise the work of its employee, Defendant Hampton, particularly where they knew she lacked the formal credentials to act as a primary clinician.
- 22. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct by Defendants, the Plaintiffs have suffered and continues to suffer severe and permanent mental distress and emotional harm as well as other consequential damages.

COUNT III

(vs. JDA, Thomas Bratter, Kenneth Steiner -- Negligent Supervision of Plaintiff Helfand)

- 23. The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the complaints as set forth in paragraphs 1 through 22 above.
- 24. At all relevant times, Defendants JDA, Thomas Bratter, and Kenneth Steiner had a duty to properly supervise Adam Helfand. The Defendants breached that duty by frequently leaving him without adult supervision at night and providing him access to a car that allowed him to leave campus.
- 25. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct by Defendants, the Plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer severe and permanent mental distress and emotional harm as well as other consequential damages.

COUNT IV

(v. Gwendolyn Hampton -- Counseling Malpractice)

26. The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the complaints as set forth in paragraphs 1 through 25 above.

27. At all relevant times, Defendant Hampton was negligent in her care and treatment of Adam Helfand.

Filed 08/17/2004

- 28. Defendant Hampton failed to exercise the degree of care and skill of the average qualified mental health counselor in treating and caring for Adam Helfand.
- 29. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant Gwendolyn Hampton's failure to exercise the degree of care and skill of the average mental health counselor, the plaintiff, Adam Helfand, has suffered and continues to suffer injuries, mental distress and emotional harm as well as other consequential damages.

COUNT V (v. JDA -- Respondeat Superior)

- 30. The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the complaints as set forth in paragraphs 1 through 29 above.
- 31. The staff members of JDA, including the named Defendant employees, failed to render appropriate and adequate care as described above to Adam Helfand, and thereby failed to exercise the degree of care and skill of the average qualified therapeutic and educational practitioners in their fields.
- 32. The Defendant, JDA, is liable for the breach of professional duty of its staff in treating and mentoring the Plaintiff.
- 33. As a direct and proximate result of the failure by the Defendant JDA's staff to exercise the degree of care and skill of average qualified practitioners in their fields, Adam Helfand has suffered severe and continuing emotional distress as well as other consequential damages.

(vs. JDA -- Breach of Contract)

34. The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the complaints as set forth in paragraphs 1 through 33 above.

Filed 08/1

7/2004

- 35. Between June 10, 1999 and August 31, 2001, the Defendant had contracts with Adam Helfand's parents, Mitchell and Caron Helfand, under which they paid Defendant JDA in excess of \$110,000, in return for which Defendants agreed to properly educate Adam Helfand in a therapeutic residential environment free from drugs, alcohol and sex. The Defendant breached their agreement with the Plaintiffs.
- 36. Adam Helfand is the intended third-party beneficiary of the contract between his parents and the Defendant and he suffered damage as a result of the Defendant's breach.

COUNT VII (vs. JDA -- G.L. c. 93A)

- 37. The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the complaints as set forth in paragraphs 1 through 36 above.
- 38. The Plaintiffs were consumers of the Defendant's educational and therapeutic services.
- 39. The Defendant promised to provide a safe, therapeutic environment for Adam Helfand that was free of the influence of alcohol, drugs and sex. For much of the course of Adam Helfand's enrollment, however, JDA failed to provide appropriate therapeutic services. Instead, his assigned therapist engaged him in an inappropriate personal and sexual relationship and provided him with alcohol and encouraged his use of illegal drugs, the very things he enrolled at JDA to avoid. These misrepresentations and omissions

7/2004

- constitute unfair and deceptive business practices under M.G.L. Ch. 93A §§ 2,9.
- 40. The Defendants' misrepresentations hindered Adam's recovery from alcohol and substance abuse, and caused him devastating emotional harm and other consequential damages.

<u>COUNT VIII</u> (vs. Gwendolyn Hampton --

Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress)

- 41. The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the complaints as set forth in paragraphs 1 through 40 above.
- 42. At all relevant times, the Defendant knew or should have known that emotional distress was a likely result of her conduct.
- 43. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct by Defendant Hampton,

 Adam Helfand suffered and continues to suffer severe and permanent

 mental distress and emotional harm as well as other consequential

 damages.

COUNT IX

(v. JDA, Thomas Bratter, Kenneth Steiner, and Gwendolyn Hampton --Loss of Consortium)

- 44. The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the complaints as set forth in paragraphs 1 through 43 above.
- 45. The Defendants, through their negligence in failing to maintain a safe therapeutic environment, wrongfully caused harm to Adam Helfand and exacerbated pre-existing conditions for which he had sought treatment at JDA.
- 46. As a result of the Defendants' conduct, Mitchell and Caron Helfand suffered the loss of their son's society and companionship.

Filed 08/17

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiffs pray this Honorable Court to grant them the following relief: all damages for personal injuries, emotional distress, and breach of contract; reasonable attorneys fees and costs; punitive damages, where appropriate, and any other damages as this Honorable Court deems just and reasonable.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

The Plaintiffs demand a trial by jury.

Respectfully submitted, The Plaintiffs, Adam Helfand, Caron Helfand, and Mitchell Helfand, By their attorneys,

Laurence E. Hardoon, B.B.O. No.: 221360 Djuna E. Perkins, B.B.O. No.: 561909

BRODY, HARDOON, PERKINS & KESTEN, LLP

One Exeter Plaza, 12th Floor

Boston, MA 02116 (617) 880-7100

Dated: August 17, 2004

JS 44 (Rev. 3.99)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		,	·	DEFENDAN'	TS			
Adam Helfand, Helfand	Caron Helfand	l, and Mitch	ne11 · ·				Inc., Thomas yn Hampton	Bratter
(b) County of Residence of (EX	f First Listed Plaintiff <u>C</u> CEPT IN U.S. PLAINT F F	CASES)			(IN U.S. F d condemi involved	PLAINTIFF CASES NATION CASES, US	E THE LOCATION OF THE	
(c) Attorney's (Fine Name Laurence E. Har Brody, Hardoon One Exeter Plan	rdoon and Djur , Perkins & Ke	ıa E. Perkir esten, LLP		Attorneys (If Kno	own) 1	18	OODP	W
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X"	in One Box Only)		ZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	AL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Place and One Box for Defendant	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	nent Not a Party)	l		PEF 1 🗆 L	Incorposated or l of Business in	-	KX.
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	XX4 Diversity (Indicate Citiz in Item III)	enship of Parties		of Another State			d Principal Place ☐ 5 Another State	□ 5 □ 6
AND ANA OR ELEMENT ON THE OTHER	v /m««//»:«	N D. O.L.	1	ign Country				_
IV. NAT URE OF SUIT		RTS	FORF.	EITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTE	s
110 Insurance 120 Maring 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 140 Negotiable Instrument 140 Negotiable Instrument 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recavery of Overpayment of Student Loans (Excl. Vetesans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Force losure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torta to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Slander Slander Slander Slander Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 M ntor V chiele 355 M utor V chiele Product Liability X 360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voring 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommod alions 444 W clfare 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETIT 510 Mations to Vace Sentence Habres Corpus: 530 General 535 De ath Penalty 440 Mandamus & O 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition	RY 614 624 625 6	Agriculture O Other Food & Drug Forug Related Scizure of Property 21 USC Liquor Laws O R. R. & Truck O Airline Regs. O Occupational Safety/Health	□ 422 App □ 423 Witi Z8 U PROPE □ 820 Cop □ 830 Pate □ 840 Trac SOCIA □ 861 III.A □ 862 Blai □ 863 DlW □ 864 SSI □ 865 RSI FEDER □ 870 Trac □ 871 JRS	eal 28 USC 158 hdrawat ISC 157 IRTY RIGHTS syrights int femark L. SECURITY (13.95ff) ck Lung (923) C/DIW W (405 (g)) D Tilk XVI	400 State Respontionmen 410 Antitust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates 460 Deportation 460 Reportation 470 Racke teer Influenced Corrupt Organization 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodit Fachange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 891 Agricultural Acts 392 Economic Stabilizati 393 Bavirona ental Mattes 394 Energy Albeation Act 395 Freedom of Information Act 390 Appeal of Determational Access Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 380 Other Statutory Activ	s/ctc. mand s ixs/ on Act rs ct For
V. ORIGIN Kal Original □ 2 R			□ 4 Reinst Reope	another \Box 5 (specification)	ferred from er district fy)	□ 6 Multidist		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI		ute underwhich you are : nal statutes unless diversit		brief statement of cause.				
28 U.S.C	. section 1332	2						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.	S IS A CLASS ACTI P. 23		MANDS ess of \$500		CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint	;
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY N/A		JUDG E <i>Din</i> ne	i (1)		DOCK	ET NUMBER		
8/17/04		SIGNATURE OF A	TTORNET OF	RECORD				
RECEIPT #	AMOUN	APPLYING IFP		· JUDGE		MAG. JIJI	DGE	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

_	ory in which	the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed on the civil cover sheet. (See					
local a	ule 40.1(a)())).					
	i.	160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.					
	II.	195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 730, *Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 for patent, trademark or copyright cases					
XX	Ш,	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 380, 385, 450, 891.					
	IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 660,					
		690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 900.					
	V.	150, 152, 153.					
	strict pleas	If any, of related cases. (See local rule 40.1(g)). If more than one prior related case has been filed in a indicate the title and number of the first filed case in this court.					
Наэ а	orior action	Detween the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in this court?					
	Later manage						
	the complai C §2403)	YES NO A This case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public Interest? (See					
		YES NO X					
lf so, i	s the U.S.A.	or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party?					
		YES NO					
ls this	case requi	red to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284? YES NO					
	chusetts ("	es in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule					
		YES NO X					
	A,	If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside?					
		Eastern Division Central Division Western Division					
	В.	if no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside?					
	•	Eastern Division Central Division Western Division					
		FRemoval - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If are sheet identifying the motions)					
		YES NO					
	OR PRINT						
ASE TYPI	-	urence E. Hardoon and Djuna E. Perkins/Brody, Hardoon, Perkins & Kesten,					